

### **REMARKS**

In response to the Office Action dated June 24, 2005, Applicants respectfully request reconsideration.

Claim 3 stands objected to because of an informality in line 3. Applicants have amended the claim as suggested by the Examiner.

#### **Claim Rejections - 35 U.S.C. §102(e)**

Claims 1-8, 10-20, and 22-27 stand rejected under 35 USC 102(e) as anticipated by U.S. Patent No. 6,775,358 B1 (Breitenbach). Applicant respectfully assert that these claims are patentable over Breitenbach.

Regarding independent claim 1, Breitenbach does not teach, disclose or suggest a method including providing a user with repeatable access to a bookmark in a voice application in order to return to the bookmarked location. Breitenbach discusses a system that responds to incoming telephone calls by dynamically generating a source file of caller-specific audio content (Col. 1 lines 6-10). If the caller interrupts the playback of the audio content, a voice engine updates a history record with the location in the interruption (Col. 17 Lines 43-53, cited by the Examiner). On the next call, the system asks if the caller would like continue where the caller left off (Col. 14 lines 36-37, cited by the Examiner). When the playback of the audio content is rendered, the current history record is cleared and replaced with an updated history record (Page 11 of June 24, 2005 Office Action). Therefore, the caller in Breitenbach can continue where the caller left off only once (i.e. only when prompted on the next call) because the history data is cleared after each subsequent call. In contrast, claim 1 recites a method including providing a user with repeatable access to a bookmark in a voice application in order to return to a bookmarked location in the voice application. The user in claim 1 may create bookmarks and return to the locations that correspond to those bookmarks during the current and future calls. The user in Breitenbach is limited to a single location stored for only a single call. For at least these reasons, independent claim 1, and claims 2-8 which depend directly and indirectly from claim 1, are patentable over Breitenbach.

Independent claim 10 is also patentable over Breitenbach. Independent claim 10 recites an apparatus for providing a user access to a voice application through a computer network including a server coupled to the computer network, wherein the server has a processor that is

programmed to provide a user with repeatable access to the bookmark in the voice application in order to return to the bookmarked location. As discussed above, Breitenbach does not teach, disclose or suggest providing a user with repeatable access to a bookmark in a voice application in order to return to a bookmarked location in the voice application. For at least these reasons, independent claim 10, and claims 11-16 that depend directly from claim 10, are patentable over Breitenbach.

Independent claims 17, 22, and 23 are also patentable over Breitenbach. Independent claims 17, 22 and 23 recites features to provide a user with repeatable access to a bookmark in a voice application in order to return to a bookmarked location in the application. As discussed above, Breitenbach does not teach, disclose or suggest providing a user with repeatable access to the bookmark in the voice application in order to return to the bookmarked location. For at least these reasons, independent claim 17, claims 18-20 that depend directly and indirectly from claim 17, independent claim 22, independent claim 23, and claims 24-27 that depend directly from claim 23, are patentable over Breitenbach.

#### Claim Rejections - 35 U.S.C. §103(a)

Claims 9, 21, and 28 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Breitenbach in view of the Applicants' allegedly admitted prior art (AAAPA). Applicants respectfully assert that these claims are patentable over Breitenbach and the AAAPA. The Examiner does not assert that the AAAPA makes up for the deficiencies of claims 1, 17, and 23. Thus claim 9, that depends directly from claim 1, claim 21, that depends indirectly from claim 17, and claim 28, that depends directly from claim 23, are patentable over Breitenbach and the AAAPA.

Claims 29-34 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Breitenbach in view of "Uniform Resource Identifiers" (Berners-Lee) in further view of the AAAPA, and further in view of U.S Patent No. 5,895,471 (King). Applicants respectfully assert that these claims are patentable over Breitenbach, Berners-Lee, the AAAPA, and King.

Applicants respectfully assert that there is no motivation to combine Breitenbach, Berners-Lee and King. Berners-Lee discusses URL's as a type of URI that provide a simple and extensible means for identifying a resource (page 2, lines 1-2 and page 3, section 1.2, first paragraph, cited by the Examiner). King discusses requesting a name for a bookmark from a

user because URL's are difficult to remember (Col. 11 lines 35 and lines 55-59, cited by the Examiner). Breitenbach discusses a system that responds to incoming telephone calls by dynamically generating a source file of caller-specific audio content (Col. 1 lines 6-10). If the caller interrupts the playback of the audio content, a voice engine updates a history record with the location in the interruption (Col. 17 Lines 43-53, cited by the Examiner). On the next call, the system asks if the caller would like continue where the caller left off (Col. 14 lines 36-37, cited by the Examiner). Since the system in Breitenbach automatically records the location of the interruption, it would be undesirable and unnecessary to further prompt the user for a name of a bookmark (i.e., as discussed in King). Additionally, on the subsequent call, the caller in Breitenbach needs only answer whether the caller wants to continue where the caller left off without regard to the name of a bookmark (as in King), nor a specific URI (as in Berners-Lee). Thus, it would also be undesirable to further complicate the call-back procedure in Breitenbach by prompting the user for a bookmark name when Breitenbach requires only a yes/no input from the user. Accordingly, the combination of Breitenbach, Berners-Lee and King is improper (MPEP 2143.01). For at least these reasons, claims 29-34 are patentable over Breitenbach, Berners-Lee, the AAAPA, and King.

Claims 35 and 36 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Breitenbach, in view of the AAAPA, and further in view of King. Applicants respectfully assert that these claims are patentable over Breitenbach, the AAAPA, and King. As discussed above, the combination of Breitenbach and King is improper (MPEP 2143.01) as combining King with Breitenbach would undesirably and unnecessarily complicate Breitenbach. For at least these reasons, claims 35 and 36 are patentable over Breitenbach, the AAAPA, and King.

Based on the foregoing, this application is believed to be in allowable condition, and a notice to that effect is respectfully requested. The Examiner is invited to call Applicants' Attorney at the number provided below with any questions.

Respectfully submitted,

*for* *S.H. Hunter* *reg no. 54,039*

Shane H. Hunter  
Registration No. 41,858  
Attorneys for Applicants  
Mintz, Levin, Cohn, Ferris,  
Glovsky and Popeo, P.C.  
One Financial Center  
Boston, MA 02111  
Telephone 617/348-1765  
**Customer No. 30623**

Date: August 24, 2005